DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 347 FL 027 810

AUTHOR	Lainio, Jarmo
TITLE	European Linguistic Diversity--For Whom? The Cases of Finland and Sweden. Mercator Working Papers.
SPONS AGENCY	European Union, Brussels (Belgium).
REPORT NO	WP-7
ISSN	ISSN-1133-3928
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	48p.; Produced by CIEMEN (Escarre International Centre for Ethnic Minorities and Nations), Barcelona, Spain.
AVAILABLE FROM	CIEMEN, Mercator, Rocafort 242 bis, 08029 Barcelona Catalunya, Spain. Tel: 34-93-444-38-00; Fax: 34-93-444-38-09; e-mail: mercator@ciemen.org; Web site: http://www.troc.es/ciemen/mercator.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingualism; Elementary Secondary Education; *Finnish; Foreign Countries; Immigrants; Language Maintenance; Language Minorities; *Language of Instruction; Migration Patterns; *Official Languages; Sociolinguistics; *Swedish; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Finland; *Language Contact; Language Policy; Sweden

ABSTRACT

Linguistic diversity in the Nordic countries has several dimensions. One main division is between what the majority group thinks it is about versus what the minority group thinks it is about. This paper examines the situation in Finland and Sweden, noting implications for linguistic diversity. Finland and Sweden contain five main varieties of Swedish and Finnish: majority Swedish; Swedish Finnish and Meankieli (two varieties of minority Finnish in Sweden); majority Finnish; and Finland Swedish in Finland. In both countries, linguistic diversity is in many respects about the legal right to receive instruction in the mother tongue. Sweden has promoted active bilingualism for all migrant students during the last 3 decades. This paper focuses on the following: Finland (Suomi); Sweden (Sverige); migration patterns in Finland and Sweden; language contact patterns in Finland and Sweden; and differentiated outcomes of linguistic diversity in Finland and Sweden. It notes that through the slowly improving status and prestige in Sweden of Swedish Finnish, there is greater willingness among both Finland Swedes and Finns in Finland to connect their language policies to that of Swedish in Finland. (Contains 41 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 347

ciemen

mercator

dret i legislació lingüístics

[Working papers 7

[European linguistic diversity – for whom? The cases of Finland and Sweden

Jarmo Lainio

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sergi Vilaro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

[Working papers 7

[European linguistic diversity – for whom? The cases of Finland and Sweden

Jarmo Lainio

mercator
dret i legislació lingüístics

ciemen **WORKING PAPERS**

Mercator (www.mercator-central.org) is a research programme and an information and documentation service in the field of the so-called minority languages in Europe, jointly developed by three centres which deal with different scopes: education, mass media and linguistic rights and legislation.

The Mercator-Working Papers intend to offer users of the Mercator network a series of research works or short articles in progress concerning linguistic rights, legislation and policies, mainly focusing on the use of minority languages in public life spheres.

Publisher

CIEMEN (Escarré International Centre for Ethnic Minorities and Nations)
Rocafort 242, bis
08029 BARCELONA
(CATALUNYA)
Tel. (+34.93) 444 38 00
Fax (+34.93) 444 38 09
mercator@ciemen.org
www.troc.es/ciemen/mercator

Editorial staff

Team of the Mercator-Legislation Programme:
Aureli Argemí
Virginia Unamuno
Sergi Vilaró

Note
Correspondence must be sent to the CIEMEN (address above). You can send us -by post, e-mail or fax- all documents which you consider that should be published in the working-paper collection.

The opinions, criteria and terminology used or expressed in published collaborations are not necessarily shared by CIEMEN

ISSN 1133-3928

© Jarmo Lainio, 2002

With the support of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[European linguistic diversity – for whom?
The cases of Finland and Sweden

Jarmo Lainio
Stockholm University

1. Introduction 2
2. Background 4
3. Finland (Suomi) 7
4. Sweden (Sverige) 10
5. A historical sketch of the migration patterns of Finland and Sweden 13
5.1. A historical sketch of the migration patterns of Finland 13
5.2. The migration patterns of Sweden 15
6. The treatment and development of language contacts in the Finnish and Swedish past and present 20
6 . 1. Language contact patterns in Finland 20
6. 2. Language contact patterns in Sweden 24
7. Differentiated outcomes of linguistic diversity in Finland and Sweden 34
8. Final remarks 39
9. Abbreviations 40
10. References 40

1. Introduction

Linguistic diversity in the Nordic countries, i.e. Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway and Iceland, has several dimensions, or divisions. One main division is between on the one hand what the majorities think it is about, and on the other, what minorities think it is about. Below, the situation in Finland and Sweden will be discussed at some length. The majority view is likely to concern some specific aspects. In for example Sweden, majority connotations concern Swedish, the national majority language, possibly Saami, "immigrant languages", and recently English as an asset and paradoxically, a threat to Swedish. Majority views on "immigrant languages" concern both societal support to them and the inclination to believe they are a threat to national cohesion. Among minorities, at least among the indigenous ones, support for the reproduction of their languages from the society in one form or another, is a central issue.[1] The right to become bilingual and proficient in the majority language is another.

The language situations in Sweden and Finland make up a type of reciprocal, mirror picture, with some implications also for linguistic diversity. Finland and Sweden contain five main varieties of Swedish and Finnish: majority Swedish, Sweden Finnish and Meänkieli (two varieties of minority Finnish) in Sweden, and majority Finnish as well as Finland Swedish in Finland (two national languages, the latter of which in several respects has a minority position, but its legal status is that of an official language). The number of Swedish-speakers in Finland is about the same as that of Finnish-speakers in Sweden. In both countries, linguistic diversity is to a high extent about legal rights to receive instruction in the mother tongue, even if other cultural and language status issues are also highlighted from time to time. The mentioned varieties of Swedish and Finnish, but also the positions of other languages will be discussed below.

There are also differences, for example regarding the role of the majority languages. In Sweden, the role of Swedish as a second language

---

[1] Language may be more or less a *cultural core value*. For the speakers of Swedish and Finnish, both as majority and minority languages, language seems to be such a a central core value. This is partly explained by the common history, during which other cultural and religious features have been of minor dividing importance between these groups. In addition, at the same pace as social and educational differences have decreased, language has become even more salient as a cultural divider. For some other more recently migrated groups, other cultural values have been foregrounded, for example political freedom and democracy among some Spanish-speaking groups (e.g. Chileans).

(L2) has become a central topic. It is often given priority over the role of the mother tongues or first languages (L1). At the moment, a parliamentary commission is preparing a report on the future language policy for Swedish.[2] For adults, a central issue is to what extent and under what circumstances refugees should be given instruction in Swedish as a second language. There is a great pressure for all to attain a high level of competence in Swedish, "perfect Swedish". The new policy, however, is mainly geared at dealing with Swedish in competition with English in Sweden.

In Finland, due to the general impression among both migrants and Finns, that Finnish is different from many other languages, and therefore difficult, the near-native command of Finnish is still not expected, but demands on both the educational system and the migrants are becoming higher. Regarding migrant background children, there is still a rather widespread, naive conception of assimilation – without retention of the mother tongue and culture – as a natural and necessary process. The target of knowing Finnish well for Finland Swedes is an implicit requirement, but is still reflected in stereotypical and even stigmatising attitudes towards Swedish-speakers' use of Finnish. It is also seen in the legal status for both national languages: all citizens aspiring for higher state employment positions need a formal attestation of their bilingual language competence. For Finland Swedes in Finland, the legal protection of Swedish as one of the national, official languages, has meant that knowledge of Swedish is an asset also for majority speakers of Finnish. In addition, it has traditionally been a key to contacts with other Scandinavians, since the mainland Scandinavian languages (Swedish, Norwegian and Danish) are closely related and mutually intelligible (less so for Danish – Swedish). The role of Finnish in Sweden, on the contrary, has been ignored in most respects for majority Swedish-speakers, and furthermore, it has been and still is questioned whether it has any value for Finnish-speakers themselves, living in Sweden.

The concept of linguistic diversity, in the sense it has been developed in the framework of a pan-European discourse on legal support to lesser used languages and recently also immigrated groups' languages, has raised little general interest and especially, practical support, in Finland and Sweden, but

[2] There is also a joint, inter-Nordic attempt to describe the possible loss of language domains for the majority languages (see http://www.siu.no/nordmalforum2001).

for different reasons. Despite this, especially Sweden has promoted "active bilingualism" for all children of migrant background, at least as a principle, during the last three decades. During the fall of 2001, the Swedish Prime Minister has also expressed a renewed interest for minority languages in political statements, for example in the annual inaugural speech to the Swedish Parliament. Finnish presidents and ministers have regularly paid due attention to the issue of Finland Swedish – and occasionally to Sweden Finnish –, but only recently to the more general issue of linguistic diversity beyond that of the national languages. Both countries have nevertheless ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. I will attempt an explanation to why and how the two countries have reached this conclusion, and describe the present situation. In order to do this, I need to give a historical background for it in both countries.

2. Background

As a major background framing, it is to be remembered that in all of the Nordic countries, though to a somewhat lesser extent in Sweden, the proportion of basically monolingual majority speakers is around 90-96 per cent (see table 1 for Sweden and Finland). The countries have, however, had different approaches in their treatment of their respective indigenous language groups. These differing approaches are dependent on, among other factors, migration patterns and the types of language contacts that have developed in the past.

In Finland, the role and rights of Swedish are recurrently highlighted, not the least since there is a pro-Finnish and, as it seems, anti-Swedish movement raising complaints about the official support for Swedish, every now and then. Swedish is a fully protected national language, according to the Constitution and the Language Act (see below).[3] The double linguistic character of Finland permeats the whole society, but only in those areas where Finland Swedish is spoken – the southern and western coastal areas – are municipalities commonly officially bilingual (or even monolingual in Swedish).

[3] This does not mean, that there is no reason for concern for the future of Finland Swedish. On the contrary, language shift is proceeding, and the functions of Swedish are decreasing among e.g. younger speakers in certain areas.

The general picture of linguistic and cultural diversity in Finland is still that the country is one of the most homogeneous in Europe. As in Sweden, there is a concentration of migrants and multilingualism to the urban centres and especially the capital area. However, not until quite recently have there developed suburbs in the Helsinki and Turku regions, which correspond to the Swedish multicultural and –lingual areas of the major cities. This development is first and foremost taking place in the eastern parts of Helsinki today. The proportion of native Finnish-speakers there may be close to 50 per cent, whereas it in its Swedish counterparts (in certain suburbs of Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö) is corresponded by close to 100 per cent non-native speakers, or second-language speakers, of the majority language. On the other hand, there are few towns in Finland today, which lack for example any non-European language community. This is maybe best seen in the development of for example fast-food and "ethnic" restaurants, which are often run by non-Finns today.

Table 1. Majority language domination in Sweden and Finland, and their indigenous languages

	Country	
Language[4]	Sweden: population 8.9 Million – speakers :	Finland: population 5.2 Million – speakers:
Swedish; Finland Swedish	L1: 90-92 %; L2: 8-10 %; (incl. about 50,000 migrants with Finland Swedish background in Sweden)	L1: 6 %; L2: ?20-30 %[5]; FL: ?60-70 %

[4] Regarding the concept of "indigenous", only languages that have been discussed as such in the two countries are included. Saami, Finnish (Sweden Finnish is officially called Finnish), Meänkieli, Yiddish and Romani chib are official minority and thus indigenous languages in Sweden. Saamiand Swedish are the only ones in Finland. However, both Romani and Russian have occurred in the Finnish discussions. Russian-speakers make up the second largest linguistic minority in Finland.

[5] This is a rough estimation: Swedish is a compulsory subject in school, but most children learn it poorly in areas were Finland Swedish is not heard in every-day life. This would concern most Finnish-speakers. On the other hand, the urbanised "triangle" which includes the capital area, the cities Turku and Tampere, and main proportions of the coastal areas, are the most densely populated and contain most Swedish-speakers. Swedish is also required as a working language in higher state employment positions, and is known well by for example many professionals with tertiary education. For the remainder, Finland Swedish is basically a foreign language, taught as a subject in school. Many returnee children and their parents have in addition learned Sweden Swedish, and some of these attend the Swedish-speaking schools of Finland, upon migration to Finland.

Finnish/ Sweden Finnish; Meänkieli	L1: 2-3 %; L2: ? (altogether ca. 250,000); L1: 0.3-0.6 % (40-70,000)	L1: 92-93 %; L2: 6-7 %; (the number of Sweden Finnish-speakers, i.e. children of once migrated Finns to Sweden returning to Finland, is unclear)
Saami (Sweden: 5 languages; Finland: 3 languages)	L1: 0.2 % (ca. 20,000), (North Saami, Lule Saami, Arjeplog Saami, Ume Saami, South Saami)	L1: 0.1% (ca. 6,500), (North Saami, Inari Saami, Skolt Saami)
Yiddish	Ca. 2-3,000 ?	? (among the Jews in Finland, mainly Swedish, Finnish and to some extent Hebrew are used)
Romani	L1: 0.3 % (about 20,000, among whom about 3,000 Finnish Roma)	L1: 0.2-0.3 % (ca 13,000 Finnish Roma, of whom 3,000 are more or less stable residents of Sweden)
Russian	-?[6]	L1: 0.5 % (ca. 20-30,000; both "Old-Russians" and recent migrants)

L1 = first language, "mother tongue"; L2 = second language; FL = foreign language

In Sweden, at a general level, much of the public interest is concentrated to these multilingual, "getto(z)ed" suburbs, in which native Swedish-speakers are in the minority. These suburbs are seen as areas of potential problems and social-ethnic unrest. A fear of segregation is repeatedly expressed, and means of reversing the concentration of non-native speakers to such suburbs are discussed. There is abundant state funding at the moment (2000-2001) for both state/municipal projects and community efforts to increase the speed of "integration". The question of what the fate of the minority languages and first languages (L1), both indigenous and migrant languages, will be as a result of such efforts, seldom reaches the front pages. Before a more historically oriented

[6] Detailed statistics not available to me.

description of views on migration patterns and language diversity is given, general outlines of the countries will be presented (Table 1).

3. Finland (Suomi)

Finland is one of the five Nordic countries (Swe. *Norden* or *de nordiska länderna*, Fi. *Pohjoismaat*) but is not part of what is usually referred to as Scandinavia, which includes the proper Scandinavian countries Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Finnish and Saami – the other main indigenous languages of Finland and Sweden – are neither included among the Nordic nor the Scandinavian languages. Finnish and Saami, which are Finno-Ugric, are together with Greenlandic (an Inuit/Eskimo language) and the isolate of Basque some of the few indigenous non-Indo-European languages of Europe. The Saamis, the aboriginal people of the North, are inhabitants of Finland, Norway and Sweden (and Russia). When discussing the general linguistic map of Finland, Finland Swedish needs to be included. Finnish and Swedish are historically, culturally and politically intertwined. Saami has played a central cultural role in the northernmost municipalities, but less so nationally.

Between the 12th century and 1809 Finland was part of the Swedish kingdom. Through the Swedes western religious and cultural influence was introduced in Finland. Especially the Lutheran Reformation had a great impact, with its support for the national languages *pro* the classical ones (Latin, Greek, Hebrew).

In 1809 Finland was lost to Russia, and turned into a semi-autonomous Grand-Duchy. From 6th December 1917 it is an independent republic. During the 19th century, nationalistic language issues recurred in discussions on the relations with the Russian Empire. Both Finnish- and Swedish-speakers avoided supporting the Imperial attempts to strengthen Russian at the cost of Swedish and Finnish. In 1863 Finnish was given the same official legal rights as Swedish, to be implemented within 20 years. About 1900 the language majority of Helsinki, the capital, became Finnish. Finland is officially bilingual (Constitution Act 1919; Language Act 1922). All Finnish municipalities are stated monolingual (in Finnish or Swedish) or bilingual (every ten years). This mainly concerns Finnish –

Swedish, but in the three northernmost municipalities also Finnish – Saami. A municipality is bilingual if more than 3,000 inhabitants or more than 8 per cent have reported the lesser used language of the municipality as their mother tongue. The language status of the municipality has repercussions on practically all spheres of life for the bilingual persons. In cases where the number or proportion of the minority is diminishing close to a critical size, however, there seems to be reluctance to change the official status of the municipality, if it implies considerable negative effects for speakers of the lesser used language (which generally concerns Swedish).

In domestic politics language and nationalistic conflicts remained front-page issues until the late 1930s. Then all Finns joined forces to defend the country from external military threats. After two wars against the Soviet Union (1939-1940 and 1941-1944), Finland lost several regions. In the east, Karelian and Finnish-speaking regions were lost. In the north, Finland lost its direct access to the Polar Sea, the Petsamo area. Skolt-Saamis were after the war moved from Petsamo to northern Finland.

Beginning in the 1950s a strong restructuring of the agricultural sector took place. This was paralleled by high birth rates and lead to a late and radical urbanisation. This resulted in mass migration to the southern and south-western parts. Lack of housing and eventually, emigration to Sweden followed. This was facilitated by the common Nordic labour market and freedom of movement without passports between the Nordic countries, in 1954. Proportionally, more Swedish-speakers migrated (especially from Ostrobothnia, with many Swedish-speakers). Finland's bonds to Sweden throughout history have been supported through the Swedish-speaking population. There is further a tradition of *Nordism*, co-operation and exchange at all civil and political levels between the five Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden). After II World War this co-operation was formalised and strengthened (see further, below).

The changes in Russia in 1989 liberated the political atmosphere in Finland. Finland is a member of the European Union (EU) since 1995. The monolingual Swedish-speaking Åland Isles – with an extensive autonomy (Autonomy Act 1920, 1951, revised 1991, internationally regulated; 1921) – expressed in a referendum the wish to stay outside the EU. In practice,

however, the main result was that they could retain a tax-free status for some goods. Indirect results of Finland's internationalisation are improvements for its minorities, e.g. through the ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1994). International conventions are usually incorporated by Act of Parliament or by Decree. They are thereafter applicable as national Finnish law. The Charter was brought into force by a Decree, 27.2. 1998. The provisions chosen were already existing or at a higher level in national law. For Swedish, 65 articles were ratified in Part III, and for Saami, 59 articles. Finland decided not to define other minorities in Part III, but stated that in practice Part II applies to e.g. the Roma.

The Research Institute for the Languages of Finland (in Helsinki) has sections for Finnish, Swedish (some 15 employees involved), Saami and Romani (and sign language). Its role is to develop vocabularies for the "domestic" languages, study their dialects, support archives and perform language board functions (language planning and corpus planning, give advice to the public).

The numbers of Finland Swedes, Finns and Saamis are possible to count on the basis of reported mother tongue in censuses. For the Roma and other groups estimations are used; ethnicity cannot be registered according to Finnish law.

Two major minority language instruments are presently being revised, the Language Act (1922, amended later) and the Saami Language Act. The new Language Act proposal, which contains few major changes, will – if approved of – be in effect from 2004. As for other aspects of possible discrimination, the Parliamentary Ombudsman shall monitor the public and official authorities. There is also for Swedish-speaker a possibility to turn to the language ombudsman at the Finland Swedish Folk Thing.

About 85 per cent of the Finns are Lutherans, 12 per cent non-confessional. Finland has about 5.2 million inhabitants, of whom one million lives in the larger Helsinki region. About 10 per cent are (bilingual) Swedish-speakers in this region. The population of Finland has doubled during the 20th century. From the early 1990s Finland has become a country of immigration, in the

first place from Russia and Estonia, but also from more distant areas. The population density is 205 in Helsinki area, but 2 in Lapland/Lappi. Finland as a whole remains sparsely populated with about 17 inhabitants per sqkm. Its total area is 338 145 sqkm.

Despite many types of language contacts throughout history, Finland has attained a proportion of 90 per cent or more speakers, for its dominant national language. The Finnish attempts to unify the nation at the cost of inherent national cultural and linguistic pluralism have been "successful", from the point of view of the assimilating group. Most minority speakers in Finland are bilingual, and many are dominant in their second language, Finnish, the majority language.

4. Sweden (Sverige)

Sweden has throughout its modern history been a politically and economically central country in the Northern European and Baltic area. Having defeated the Danes in the mid 17th century after several long-lasting wars, Sweden's position as a regional military and economic "super-power" turned fairly stable. Its borders have, however, not been stable. In the 17th and 18th centuries the size of the Swedish kingdom shifted considerably. In 1809 Sweden lost Finland, but on the other hand it formed a union with Norway between 1814 and 1905. From 1905 it has remained the same size, and it has also been able to stay neutral in the two major wars. This is also one explanation to its comparatively fast and expanding economic development after the II World War.

The domination of one major ethnic and linguistic group has been a typical feature of Sweden during the last centuries. Sweden has become more pluralistic in recent times, and today it has a proportion of foreign-born and children of migrants and national minorities that reaches about 10-15 per cent. Many migrant groups have a mother tongue-dominance in adult and elderly groups, whereas the so-called 2nd generation[7] often develops a higher command of Swedish.

[7] The concept in reality often refers to a third generation, and in some cases even a fourth, counted from the generation which itself actually immigrated.

Sweden is a kingdom, with a population of 8.9 million. To date, Sweden has not had any official language *de jure*. Swedish is the first language of about 8.2-8.4 million Swedes. Metropolitan Stockholm has about 1.6 million inhabitants. Finnish (Sweden Finnish), which is the second largest language by population, has about 250,000 speakers (language censuses are not taken; see also Table 1). About one-third of these live in the larger Stockholm area. Meänkieli, which is closely related to Finnish, has about 40,000 – 70,000 speakers in the North-Swedish Tornedalen region. A third, more isolated population of Finnish-speakers existed for four centuries in the central forest regions (Värmland, Dalecarlia) till the 1960s. An equal amount of descendants of Finland Swedish (migrants from Finland), Norwegian and Danish speakers live in Sweden: about 50,000 each.

The Saami probably inhabited the Swedish mainland down to the central parts (even south of Stockholm), when the Scandinavians arrived. There are about 20,000 Saami in Sweden, divided into several languages (sometimes five are mentioned: North Saami, Lule Saami, South Saami (the most vital today), and Arjeplog Saami, Ume Saami (endangered)). The number of fluent speakers is considerably lower. Similar to the situation in Norway and Finland, North Saami speakers make up the vast majority of all Saami speakers in Sweden.

Some archaic Swedish varieties are occasionally held to be languages, e.g. Älvdalsmål (Swe. *mål*, old form for *dialekt*) in the province of Dalecarlia. The metropolitan Stockholm area, as well as other urban centres, such as Gothenburg/Göteborg, are highly multilingual. A handful of Stockholm's western and southern suburbs are predominantly inhabited by non-Swedish-speaking migrant groups. This type of metropolitan language situation has been described in English and Dutch studies thus far, and Swedish ones are being initiated (Rampton 1995; Broeder & Extra 1998; Fraurud et al. 2001 see also Turell (ed.) 2001, for Spain).

Since 2000, Saami, Finnish, Meänkieli, Romani chib and Yiddish are official minority languages, and the groups are national historical minorities. Some of the traditional Swedish Roma form a community with the Roma of Finland. There are several Roma groups in Sweden, having different

geographical and historical origins. Their languages are not all mutually intelligible, and language shift is extensive in at least those Roma groups that have arrived earlier (Fraurud & Hyltenstam 1999). Yiddish is but one of the languages of Swedish Jews (cf. Boyd & Gadelii 1999). In the five northernmost municipalities Finnish and Meänkieli have a fairly high level of official protection. Of the minimally 35 paragraphs or sub-paragraphs in Part III that have to be accepted and managed by the ratifying part, Sweden ratified 45 paragraphs or sub-paragraphs of the Charter for Finnish and Saami, and 42 paragraphs or sub-paragraphs for Meänkieli, in the northern region. Saami is an official language in four north-western municipalities (two of the municipalities have in fact three official minority languages, Saami, Finnish and Meänkieli; Kiruna and Gällivare). Finnish outside the region of Tornedalen and the other minority languages (Romani chib and Yiddish), do not have the same type of practical support (they are protected at the lower Part II-level of the Charter), but are still supported by this symbolical statement (see also, Winsa 1999).

Main migrant languages are Arabic, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (Serbo-Croatian), English, Greek, Spanish, Turkish, Polish, Syrian. About 120 languages are taught in the form of 1-2 hours per week, in mother tongue instruction in the Swedish basic compulsory school (*Skolverket*, 2000; Lainio 2000b, forthc.). Arabic is since 1995 the most widely taught mother tongue – in addition to Swedish – in compulsory primary school (ages 7-16).

About 87 per cent of Swedish citizens are Lutheran Christians, this denomination having constituted the state church, until 2000. Roughly only 10 per cent are regular church visitors. Today, the other major world religions are becoming increasingly visible and widespread.

Sweden has traditionally participated as a forerunner in and supporter of many international NGO activities as well as in official international organisations, thus promoting international improvement – for example regarding democracy and equity – of the situation for weaker groups in varous societies. To some extent at least, it has been less inclined to support such

action for its own minorities.[8] A major problem is the lack of successful implementation of supportive principles and recommendations.

5. A historical sketch of the migration patterns of Finland and Sweden

5. 1. A historical sketch of the migration patterns of Finland

Finland has mostly been a country of emigration, especially to Sweden, and later in particular to North America. It has recurrently been the battle-field of wars between Sweden and Russia, a civil war, and during independence, wars between Finland and the Soviet Union. Refugees have thus rather left Finland, than arrived in it. Exceptions are those of the so-called "brotherhood" people, that is, of people with related languages or even biologically related people, to those of Finnish and Finns.[9]

These have from time to time seeked refuge in Finland, in order to avoid atrocities by in the first place Russian/Slavic rulers. For example, about 400,00 Karelians (including Finns, Ingrians and Vepsians) fled to Finland, when it lost Karelia to the Soviet Union in 1944. These were later, on demand, "repatriated", many of whom disappeared. Other exceptions are the Roma, who fled from Sweden in the late 16th century, and Jews, who integrated into the Swedish-speaking group in Finland, as well as the so-called Old-Russians, who stayed in Finland or moved there before independence in 1917.

Only recently, after 1989, has Finland become a country of immigration, in the modern sense. Before that some occasional groups did arrive, for example Vietnamese and Somalis during the 1980s, but more remarkable is the migration of Russians and Estonians from the late 1980s, as well as descendants of speakers of other Finnic languages, many of whom had shifted language to Russian prior to migration to Finland.

---

[8] This paradox is probably typical for most Western European democracies, but this fact has raised some astonishment among minority representatives elsewhere in Europe.

[9] English lacks the opposition between the ethnonym of Finnish-speakers and Finland Swedes. It has been proposed that "Finlanders" be used for all people living in Finland, irrespective of ethnic-linguistic background. It has not become widely used as yet. In this very context, "Finns" refers to Finnish-speakers.

A main migrant group is that of the "returnee" Finnish-speaking persons, who once emigrated to Sweden, and whose children often are dominant in Swedish. These outnumber all other categories of migrants to Finland. Some of them have kept their Finnish citizenship and thus are difficult to distinguish in demographic statistics. This return migration has been going on in the shadows of emigration to Sweden, more or less intensively during the last 50 years.

The contacts and connections between Finnish- and Swedish-speakers in Finland have either been on an equal footing among ordinary people in the areas mentioned, or in a historically, socially and economically dominated "under-dog"-position; in earlier days, Swedish-speakers (bi- or multilingual) made up a high proportion of the ruling layers of society. During the common history of Sweden-Finland, the royal court and the nobility mainly used Swedish (when the ruler was not of, for example, Polish or French origin). Many of the key public persons, religious or secular, have been Swedish-speakers as well.

The picture for Swedish-speakers has been astonishingly similar from one century to another: they have lived in the south-western parts, in the archipelago, on the Åland Isles, and in the western and southern coastal areas. After 1809, changes slowly have become more obvious. Typical of this is that even if the proportion of Swedish-speakers has decreased nationally from 17 per cent some one hundred years ago, to about 5.7 per cent today, the number of Swedish-speakers has remained rather constant, hovering around 300,000 (297, 000 in 2000). One change has been that Finnish-speakers have come to outnumber the former, both locally, due to internal in-migration, and nationally, due to higher birth rates. This concerns for example the capital area.

This background may explain, why and how one of the most supportive and protective language laws even from an international perspective, has been able to keep a stand in Finland, where the majority is monolingual in the majority language Finnish, without any direct contact with Swedish-speakers.

There are additional differences between the countries. Sweden has a fairly long tradition of contacts not only with their neighbours, but

also with people from other parts of Europe and other parts of the world. Finland has so-to-say sticked to its neighbours, both with regard to emigration and immigration patterns.

To this one should add, that Scandinavian languages and cultures are numerically stronger and surrounded by similar languages and cultures. Finland and Finnish – even if it has a handful of related minor languages in its neighbourhood – make up a language and culture periphery, surrounded by Germanic and Slavic languages and cultures. The sense of otherness has thus been contrasted to the neighbours, and only recently to newcomers from elsewhere. It has also contributed to a policy formation, the implicit and at times explicit target of which it has been to protect Finnish.

5. 2. The migration patterns of Sweden

When a rough "a-historical" picture (Map 1, see below) of migration movements is created on the basis of earlier and more recent population movements and migration waves, it immediately becomes clear that Sweden and Finland have gone through both similar and very different types of population changes. Both have soon upon their arrival to their territories, pushed the indigenous people, the Saamis, northward. At least since the early centuries of the second millenium, there has been an intense movement between the countries in both directions. There is, however, one major difference; Finns have always, since the 12th – 13th centuries, been heading for Sweden, whereas Swedish-speakers from Sweden migrated prior to that to the Finnish mainland and archipelago, and then remained there. In more recent times, Swedish-speakers have also made up a comparatively high proportion of migrants to Sweden.

Sweden has seen several different types of migrations. One has been the import of skilled labour, which has recurred in its history. This type of migration has, with the exception of its neighbours, especially Finns, been of a punctual kind. That is, the whole community has arrived in a few years and few have come later, for example Low-German merchants to Stockholm, Karlskrona

and Visby (in the 15th century), Finnish burn-beating farmers[10] to the western and central provinces in the 15th – 16th century, Walloons to the mining industry (16th century) in the provinces of central Sweden, Scotsmen to the sea-fare in Gothenburg (17th century), and much later, Italians, Yugoslavs, Greek and Finnish young men – initially at least – to the booming industry in post World War II Sweden (*Det mångkulturella Sverige*, 1990).

Sweden has also had migration of upper layers of society, both royal and nobility. The present royal dynasty has its roots in late 18th century, south-western France.

Sweden has accepted waves of refugees from all directions, e.g. Jews in the 18th century, Finns in the early 18th century, and during the era of 19th century Russian Autonomy for Finland. Other refugee waves have been the result of wars or dictatorships, in Finland, Northern Europe, Central and Southern Europe, and finally, globally – South America, Asia, Africa – during the bulk of the 20th century. These have also been – in a historical perspective – rather punctual in kind.

In addition, Sweden's international aspirations, not to say its imperialistic concerns, lead to annexation of both border areas (five provinces in the south and the west from Denmark/Norway in the 17th century), and more distant regions, such as expansion of the borders of Sweden-Finland, to the Baltic area, to parts of Germany, and Russia. During the 17th - 18th centuries, and the so-called Great Power era, there were about 20 different ethnic and linguistic groups residing within its borders (Huovinen 1986).

Sweden has also faced several waves of heavy emigration, especially to North America, but also to South America and Australia. In fact, the essence of attitudes with regard to immigration to Sweden, may be said to reflect a paradox: one has tended both to understand and accept the reasons for refugees to come to Sweden or to come for work, and to demand adaptation, linguistically and culturally. This may to some extent reflect the emigrant

[10] The reason why these farmers were especially well suited and welcome to participate in the taming of the large forestial areas in Central Sweden, was their use of burn-beating methods. This meant that they first burned, as a way of fertilising, the land, in order to receive better crops the following years. This also facilitated the expansion of use of land for agriculture in general.

experiences of Swedish Americans: they needed to leave, but they were expected to adapt, in order to become "good" American citizens.

In sum, the Swedish experiences of linguistic diversity has included several important characteristics, and ensuing steps of assimilation:

- continuous (in-)migration, one portion being Finns throughout history,
- the historical burden and dreams of a super-power position in Northern Europe,
- recurrent needs to fill labour shortages, to employ expert labourers/craftsmen, both historically and in modern times, and
- repeated, punctual waves of refugees.

The above said is a sketch, and many details and most certainly, many distinct migrant groups have been left out from the description. Still, we end up in a rough, contrastive picture of the two countries, where one – Sweden – is a country with centuries-old traditions of immigration, imperialistic aspirations and a tradition of strong assimilation. The other one – Finland – is a country of emigration, dominated by other powers and thus investing in enduring attempts to protect and revive its own main language and culture. On the other hand, it has a strong minority group within its borders, for whom the acceptance of bilingualism and diversity has been a prerequisite for social and linguistic careers. Only recently has Finland's social and economic success allowed it to become a target of labour and refugee migration. A summarising map would be like Map 1, and the statistical outcome with regard to different main groups in the two countries is given in Table 2.

Map 1. Migration movements to and from Finland and Sweden

This rough description of the historical migration movements (Map 1) should be complemented with some recent statistical data on the ten largest groups of migrants, based on citizenship (Table 2).

Table 2. Main migrant groups in Sweden and Finland, based on citizenship in original country (year = 2000)

Country of origin	In Sweden, citizens in country of origin	Country of origin	In Finland, citizens in country of origin
1. Finland	98,571	1. Russia	20,552
2. Iraq	33,116	2. Estonia	10,839
3. Norway	31,997	3. Sweden	7,887
4. Denmark	25,567	4. Somalia	4,190
5. Yugoslavia	20,188	5. Yugoslavia	3,575
6. Poland	16,667	6. Iraq	3,102
7. Germany	16,357	7. Former Soviet Union	2,447
8. Turkey	15,846	8. Great Britain	2,207
9. Iran	14,324	9. Germany	2,201
10. Great Britain	13,062	10. USA	2,010

(Sources: Statistics Finland/ Tilastokeskus,
http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/tk/tp/tasku/taskus_vaesto.html, and,
Statistics Sweden/Statistiska Centralbyrån, http://www.scb.se/databaser/makro/)

In addition to this (Table 2), there are 22 other countries of origin in Sweden, with between 2,000 and 11,500 citizens in each of them. The figures on citizenship do not, however, give a full picture of the multilingual and multicultural mix of the countries. First, the older the migrant group is, the higher is the proportion of naturalised citizens. Therefore, the figures for country of birth might differ considerably from those of the citizens. Second, there are also citizens of these countries that were born in the host country. In both respects, Sweden has more "hidden" migrants and children of migrants in the demographic statistics. Finally, the language contacts within the countries would become even more complex if all languages spoken by the people were considered. For example, the

figures for Turkey, Iraq and Iran may hide high proportions of Kurdish-speakers, just as does Finnish citizens contain about one-fourth of Finland Swedish-speakers. For the purposes of this paper, the data on the ten largest groups concerning foreign citizens suffices, however.

6. The treatment and development of language contacts in the Finnish and Swedish past and present

6. 1. Language contact patterns in Finland

Finland has always been divided into two *competing* or *co-existing* ethnolinguistic groups and one *"escaping"* language minority. The "escaping" group consists of the Saamis, who ever since Finnic people entered the Finnish mainland, have been pushed further north. The Saamis were there at the dawn of history in Finland. To some extent have the Swedish-speakers, who migrated to Finland – no later than the 11th century – also contributed to a diminishing space for the Saamis. Whereas the Saamis have redrawn from the linguistic market, Swedish-speakers and Finnish-speakers have co-existed and to some extent competed about the leading role in Finland. During the common Swedish kingdom, which included Sweden and Finland and temporarily also other regions such as parts of Balticum, Swedish was dominant in the whole kingdom, even if other languages, especially Low-German, but also French and Latin have occupied some specific domains. The eastern part, Finland, never reached more than one-third of the population of the total of Sweden-Finland. Swedish-speakers also constituted a mirror population to Finnish-speakers in the Finnish part, at least in the lower layers of society. Until the late 19th century, the Finnish-speakers were in a dominated position vis-à-vis Swedish-speakers with regard to the official status and public functions of their language. This historical "under-dog" position continues to live in the collective memory of Finnish-speakers. To some extent is this felt to be strengthened by the view on the common history of Sweden-Finland, in the two countries. In Finland the average person has learned about the significance of the common history for the shaping of the later national histories. In Sweden the knowledge and recognition of these historical aspects are at best acknowledged, but more often quite limited.

In addition to the mentioned three groups, there have been occasional migration waves into Finland, mostly of neighbouring people, like the Russians, and other Finnic people (Karelians, Ingrians, Estonians). The latter have to a high extent been assimilated. So, even if the Finns have always been in contact with speakers of other languages, the selection has been restricted, until the 1980s. One should add that minor speaker-groups of other languages have co-existed with both the Finnish- and Swedish-speaking Finns. Among these at least the Roma, Tatars and the Russian-speakers should be mentioned. The first Roma escaped from Sweden in the 16th century, and the Tatars arrived in the 18th century. Of the former, about 10,000 live in Finland, the majority of whom speak Finnish as their dominant language, leaving the competence of the language to be transmitted by elderly today. Among the Tatars, of whom about 1,000 live in Finland, the situation is similarly threatening to their language maintenance.

Among foreign languages Latin had some space during the Swedish reign. During the era of the Russian Empire (1809-1917), at least at the end of it, a Russian community was developing around the official and military presence, especially in Helsinki. This created some authentic interest for the Russian language and culture. The attempt to spread pan-Slavism was, however, unsuccessful.

For the most part, both historically and in numbers, Finnish-speakers have learned Swedish for their social and educational careers, and in modern times Swedish-speakers have in addition learned Finnish, out of practical necessity or for ideological reasons – Finland has also been their country. The Saamis have had little contact with Swedish in Finland, but more with Swedes and Norwegians in the neighbourhood of their homeland, in addition to that with Finnish-speakers.

Like in Sweden, German was a main foreign language until after World War II, when English started competing with it. Somewhat later than in Sweden, which introduced English as a first foreign language in school in 1946, Finns started opting for English as a first foreign-language choice. Today, it strongly competes with Swedish (for Finnish-sepakers), the other national and official language.

The national policy has since 1917 been that of the Constitution, stating that the two national languages are Finnish and Swedish, and with the Language Act of 1922, saying that all citizens shall have some knowledge of the other national language. For Swedish-speakers this has become more of a necessity, but for the great majority of Finnish-speakers, it has rather been sensed as a forced-upon foreign language, with which they have little contact in every-day life. The discourse on whether or not Finnish-speakers should learn Swedish as their first, or at least as a compulsory language in school, is known as the debate on 'obligatory Swedish' (Fi. "pakko-ruotsi"). In some recent surveys, contrary to the political consensus in Parliament, Finns have opposed (with 65-70 per cent) the compulsory instruction of Swedish.

It is clear that the group of Swedish-speakers, both directly as users of Swedish, and indirectly through the compulsory teaching of Swedish or Finnish-speakers, have contributed to the fact that Nordic co-operation (Nordism) has been both successful and long-lasting. For Swedish-speakers this has meant that Swedish has remained an asset in the labour market and in official positions, as well as for international/Nordic co-operation. Thus, it probably has supported the striving for language maintenance of Swedish in Finland.

With regard to a general view on bilingualism in Finland there is a clear paradox. Despite the fact that Finland boasts with one of the most liberal and supportive language legislations in the Western world, little mention is made of bilingualism. On the contrary, as long as the position of Finland Swedes has been one of an equal, national language group, on *a par* with Finnish-speakers, the whole language infrastructure, including the educational system, has not targeted bilingualism *per se*, but monolingual support for the weaker language at the local and national level. Not until recently, to some extent influenced by the discussion on the one hand on Sweden Finns in Sweden, and on the other, recent migrants, has an explicit debate started on the bilingual dimension. It is telling, that despite the one-century long official duality with two languages, no research tradition existed on the bilingual usage and functions of language, until the late 1980s (however, there are quite a few demographic and sociological studies on language use). The introduction of immersion programmes in Swedish for Finnish-speaking families at the end of the 1980s, has partly changed this. These programmes have had as one – expected – effect, that more positive attitudes to

Swedish have spread. The implementation of what has partly been based on weak bilingual programmes modelled on those in Sweden, has however had little chance to become successful for migrant languages. The mother-tongue instruction covers 2 hrs/week, and is not available everywhere or for all languages.

Two recent changes have occurred on the Finnish stage. The increasing pressure to open the borders to Russia and Estonia has created two significant ethnolinguistic groups, the Russian-speakers (20,000 – 30,000), and Estonians (15,000) people, most of whom live in the southern capital region of Helsinki. Finland has signed a bilateral agreement with Russia (in 1992), to support the Russian language and culture in Finland, and correspondingly, Russia has agreed to support Finno-Ugric languages and cultures in Russia.

Finland has recently opened its borders (minimally) also for migrants and refugees to sneak in, the latter from specific developing countries. For example Vietnamese, Kurds, and Somalis are developing their own migrant communities. An earlier policy to scatter migrants around Finland to different municipalities, in order to assimilate them and speed up the learning of Finnish, seems to have been altered. Dispersing the members of such migrant groups is, like in Sweden, a part of the regional, housing and labour market policies. Rural and peripheral municipalities create better conditions for all their citizens regarding for example public services and employment opportunities, with the influx of migrants. The Somalis and the Vietnamese have, however, become prototypical "Others" in the eyes of Finns, and have thus been forced to face ethnic and linguistic prejudice and discrimination. But, they have also received some of the expected societal and human support from the Finns.

With regard to the general policy towards migrants, it can be said that Finland woke up late, but seems to have decided at least at the higher political levels, to take a progressive route to the integration of minorities. For example, Finland was one of the first countries to ratify the European Council's Charter on Regional or Minority Languages in 1994. It then covered Finland Swedish and Saami, but other languages such as Romani were mentioned, on the basis of practice, but not explicit legislation. Finland took the stand that the majority society should not decide on behalf of the groups themselves which groups should be counted as minorities. It also left open the number of possible additional groups,

such as Russian, Tatar and Yiddish, which have been acknowledged under Part II of the Charter. In practice, both as a result of legislation and the slow awakening in municipal and administrative levels of society, the progress has been slow and slight, thus far. The self-critical acknowledgement of the problems, which for example also concern the Roma and the Saamis, is a good sign, but it is obvious that the practical implementation of measures planned is a real problem, not easily solved. One practical problem for the maintenance support of several of the languages, is that there are few competent young speakers left of for example Romani and two of the three Saami languages, Inari Saami and Skolt Saami. Another is, that the Russian-speakers are ethnically mixed and historically disparate.

6.2. Language contact patterns in Sweden

Several different types of language contacts have left their marks on the languages and cultures of the Nordic countries. The oldest one is that of the Saami and Scandinavian settlers (in Sweden and Norway), and Saami and Finnish settlers (in Finland; 2500 – 200 BC). In Northern and older place names, and in specific vocabulary the Saami impact is obvious. The reverse influence of the majority societies and languages is more apparent in Saami, however. In the three capitals Helsinki, Oslo and Stockholm, high proportions of Saami speakers live today; for example, maybe as many as one-third of the Finnish Saami live in Helsinki.

The second known, main type/period consists of *Scandinavian expansionism*, which includes the Viking era (800-1100). During this period, the Faroes, Iceland and Greenland received their first Scandinavian settlers. The Danes and Norwegians set out westward. A somewhat older or simultaneous type is the Swedish settlement of southern and western Finland. These two types of migration formed a basis for what has later become *Scandinavian semi-communication*. Later, this was supported and facilitated by the ideology of pan-Nordism (see below).

When the Viking era dominance of Denmark was weakened, its rule in the Baltic Sea was soon replaced by that of others. The

commercial union of the Hanseatic League, especially under the leadership of Lübeck in the 14th and 15th centuries, was particularly successful. The League for some time ruled the whole Baltic Sea as well as the North Sea. The establishment of Low German merchant layers in the main cities, Stockholm, Kalmar and Visby in Sweden, Copenhagen in Denmark and Bergen in Norway, paved the way for an extensive linguistic influence on the local languages. In Sweden this created a new prestige language; Low German became the language of the merchants, and the townspeople became highly influenced by its cultural impact. About one-third of modern Swedish is said to consist of Low German vocabulary. This indicates a high degree of bilingualism among important layers of Swedish-speakers.

Scandinavian semi-communication (which could also be called regional interlingual communication) basically functions thanks to the common historical development of the Scandinavian languages, of Danish, Norwegian, Icelandic and Swedish. In addition, many Finns have both had everyday contact with Finland Swedish, and for several centuries needed Swedish for their civil careers. With phonological modifications, use of common vocabulary, avoidance of "difficult" language-specific features (for example Danish numerals), most Nordic citizens knowing a Scandinavian language may communicate with each other. The demand to modify the speech is the highest for Danes and Icelanders, who are linguistically the furthest away from common Scandinavian. Finns speaking Swedish as their L2, and even some Finland Swedes, experience difficulties understanding Danish, to a higher extent than for example Swedes (Börestam 1994).

During most modern historical phases, since the centralisation of the monarchy and the administration following the Vasa dynasty's attempts (from the 16th century and onwards) to unify the kingdom, the centralisation of language (towards monolingualism and homogenisation of culture) has continued unabated. In comparison, it seems that the Swedish kingdom was both early (16th century) and successfully centralised, long before other super-powers of Europe had developed similar ideas to promote national cohesion. One difference and factor of success is held to be, that the king's central administration managed to create links to the peasants through a local/regional bailiff system, thus making the nobility partly irrelevant for the royal implementation of for example the new taxation system. In addition, the king was able to speak rather directly to

the people through the bailiff system (Hallenberg 2001). Though it has not been a target of study thus far, it can be assumed that the role of Swedish was strengthened through this system, in comparison to one in which there were additional levels, using other languages, in the power hierarchy. The breakthrough of the Reformation – with its pressure to preach in the language of the (majority) people – simultaneously supported such a system. In fact, it seems that this gave an additional cause for pushing Swedish into the central role of a unifying, common language. In Finland the Reformation did open possibilities to use Finnish, at least locally. At the national level, however, when Finnish-speakers wanted to extend this language "right" to the Swedish mainland, such attempts regularly failed (Huovinen 1986).

A prerequisite for the mentioned Scandinavian semi-communication is the idea and philosophy of a shared political agenda. Even if the Scandinavian/Nordic countries have followed their individual traces, and competed with each other throughout history, they have in modern times co-operated at various political, educational and cultural levels. The creation of a pan-Nordic philosophy (Swe. *nordism*) in the 1860s, created the basis for further close co-operation. This was revitalized in the mid-1900s. A common labour market and travelling without passports between the Nordic countries since the mid-1950s have supported such co-operation and contacts. *Nordism* has been supported in many formalised ways, both at the local administrative and national political levels. The exchange of ideas, culture and ordinary people between the countries and between selected "partnership" towns in several countries, has continued to our days and in some respect has enabled the historically based Scandinavian communication to be prolonged in the form of a wider mutual understanding between Nordic citizens. This has partly been achieved through agreements to teach the neighbouring (Scandinavian) languages and about these countries in school. Through the existence of Finland Swedish, the common history of Sweden and Finland, and the role of Danish in Iceland, Greenland and the Faroe Islands, this co-operation has been extended to include also these countries. The role of Danish as a high variety in Norway for some 700 years has also been of great importance (Vikør 1993).

During the last decades this communicative potential has weakened, and so has the striving for a common political agenda. Denmark,

Finland and Sweden are members of the EU, Norway and Iceland are not. Despite this, both in practical administrative, political life and in the attitudes of people from the Nordic countries, there is a sense of togetherness, that goes beyond the ordinary neighbourhood or regional identity of Scandinavia. Since the Saami have more or less been excluded from such cooperation, they have created their own Nordic networks, both between Saami speakers of the same language and community in different countries, and between different Saami language groups in the same country. They have formed their own Saami Parliaments in the three countries, and they have a common Nordic Saami Council (e.g. Aikio et al. 1994). The Saami have also been a driving force in the work of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples.

Today, traditional Nordism is getting competition from EU co-operation. To some extent is it also being challenged by the attempts to integrate the three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Nordic sphere. Even if this would seem to imply an increasing use of English, the Scandinavian languages still remain the foundation for Nordic intercultural communication.

The fourth important type of different layers of language impact is that resulting from transnational cultural exchange, such as the use of Latin for clerical and schooling purposes from early medieval times. This was apparent until the 18th century. It was weakened in similar ways in all of the countries, by the Lutheran Reformation and the translations of the Bible in the 16th century. This created the basis for the national standard languages to develop (later in Norway and Finland, however). During the 17th and 18th century the nobility's willingness to identify with Parisian culture left its mark on especially Danish and Swedish.

The fifth type is that of continuous migration to and settlements of Finns in Sweden and Norway, from about the 15th century AD. Vast areas were settled and farmed by these so-called forest Finns, who faced language death during the late 1960's. Attempts to revitalise and study their historical development have been promoted in recent years. A separate but early migration was that of Finns to Stockholm, which has been continuous for about 700-800 years. These migrations represented internal migration within Sweden

until 1809, later it turned into emigration from Finland to Sweden (less to Norway and Denmark). From the 1880s to 1985 Finns were the dominant migrant group. Contrary to Finland Swedes in Finland, who have maintained their language in the same regions for a millennium, the Sweden Finns in Sweden have constantly been under societal pressure to shift language.

Since the 1930s, political and military disasters in various parts of Europe have brought short-term but notable populations of migrants to Sweden: Jews during and after the WW II, Estonians and other Baltic people before, during and after the war, the so-called Finnish refugee "war-children" (about 65-70,000 children were temporarily – so it was believed – transported to Sweden), Hungarians in 1956, Greeks in 1968, Chileans in 1972, Iranians from 1983 with a peak in 1985, and after that the 1990s brought the Bosnians, Croats, Serbs and Albanians. This forms a sixth type: sporadic refugee or migration waves to all of the Scandinavian countries, during and after World War II. Refugee migration has generally been punctual in kind, compared to the continuous migration between the Nordic countries. Especially due to the booming post-World War II economy of the Nordic countries, first in Sweden and later in Norway, Denmark and Finland, all countries have received notable numbers of labour force from, first, their neighbouring countries, then from Southern Europe, and recently globally. The most significant of these migration waves was that of Finns to Sweden from the late 1950s to the late 1980s, with a peak in 1969-1970 of 80,000 migrants (about one-third returned within three years). Following the experiences of importing labour from Finland, Denmark and Norway, Sweden actively looked for young men to contribute to the booming industry in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, especially from Italy, Greece and Yugoslavia. Though this from a historical point of view is recurrent – the repeated influx of labour and refugee groups – one and the same treatment of them has until the 1970s been *legio*: assimilation.

The seventh type of language contacts is the recent globalisation of migration, since about the mid-1980s. The whole pattern of refugee migration changed to become a global one. Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda, Vietnam, Bolivia and so on, have been recent sources of migration. A similar development, but with somewhat different language groups in them, has thus taken place in all major Nordic countries. This has also later lead to multilingual areas in the metropolitan regions, and new types of bi- and multilingual language use, where

the majority language becomes a *lingua franca*. This development is thus far not well studied, but language contact effects are clearly observable, mainly as a form of new "youth Swedish", based on L2 features, local varieties of Swedish, and different L1s (Fraurud et al., 2001; Bijvoet, forthc.)

Whereas the labour migrants have been slowly and sometimes painfully assimilated or integrated, the global and seventh type so far shows little signs of a corresponding integration. The neighbouring and other European groups have taken about 30-40 years to become a more integrated part of society, but the take-off seems to become much heavier for the non-European groups. A debate has taken place on the alleged opposition of either learning Swedish or remaining in the "gettoized" suburban surroundings of the larger cities. One popular view has been that as soon as the partly gettoized migrant suburbs are split up and the people have learned "perfect Swedish" – a term actually used – there will be little problems left for the integration of these migrants. This is clearly not so; in recent surveys (e.g. Kommunförbundet, 2001-04-23), about every fifth to tenth interviewee report that they have been subject to racial or ethnic discrimination.

The last type of language contact is again a matter of cultural and linguistic transfer, rather than the transfer of people. The increasing presence of English in Scandinavia has been seen as an asset since the 1950s, especially in Sweden, but has recently become a matter of concern. English seems to be diminishing the domains of the national languages (except in Iceland; cf. the articles in Graddol & Meinhof (eds) 1999, Hyltenstam 1999, and Boyd & Huss (eds.) 2000). Especially the Scandinavian languages, but also Finnish, are experiencing an hitherto unseen foreign linguistic and cultural penetration; Anglicisation has become a topic of national as well as common Nordic concern. In all countries, English is by far the most popular – and the only compulsory – foreign language in school (it is another matter that Finns sometimes refer to the learning of Swedish in Finland as a foreign language, which for some corresponds to the factual situation).

Sweden has, contrary to Finland, always been a target of migration from many sources. And, as it seems, it has always, at least since the 16th century, attempted to assimilate and integrate the "others" to the mainstream

of Swedish language and cultural behaviour. Being one of the earliest heavily centralised state administrations of Europe, the Swedish one was also successful in its implementation and spread of one single national, standardised language (Barddal *et al.* (eds.), 1997). The Saamis, Finns, Roma, Dutch, Jews, Scots, Walloons, Norwegians, Danes etc, have in the long run all faced the same fate, assimilation, irrespective of their indigenous or migrant status in Sweden.

In general, there have been other languages co-existing with Swedish throughout history, and in several ways. Few languages used by recent migrants have managed to survive long, one exception being the Estonian community, which for example has had its own school for about 50 years. These "foreign" groups to Sweden have been met with:

- a striving for conformity, both structurally expressed as a centralised administration of the kingdom and its citizens, and ideologically expressed as a pressure to homogenise and assimilate the population,
- since the 16th – 17th century, an increasing pressure to build up national cohesion around one language and culture, the Swedish one, and
- a homogeneous secondary socialization, through a common public, folk school in 1842, which was decided – almost without exception – to take place in Swedish.

This tradition was challenged only in the late 1960s, when a liberal attitude was expressed. This was clearly formulated in 1975, in a committee work on integration of "immigrants", which should be based on the three concepts *equality – freedom of choice – partnership*. This included all minority groups.

In retrospect, it seems that this liberal view has had great difficulties in trying to counteract the historical continuous assimilationist view, especially with regard to language. One could add to this, that the present-day dominant cultural feature of how to deal with conflicts, that of compromising without aggression, has made alternative suggestions of how to construct a national mixture or bricolage of cultural and linguistic diversity, a failing alternative. The attitudes about what is "normal", are still that it consists of the monolingual Swedish-speaker. One could therefore claim, that this is a strong continuous, or

"durée" dimension (see Blommaert's concepts of *durée* and *événement*, 1999), i.e. a diachronically salient feature, in the Swedish treatment of minorities.

This may explain, even if both individuals and other factors have surely contributed to it, why for example human *linguistic* rights are not seen as a hot issue in Sweden. Other principles and rights have been easier to integrate to become natural parts of normative behaviour, such as political democracy and equality between social classes as well as between the sexes. The self-evident interpretation of how to deal with linguistic and ethnic multitude, has been how to assimilate. The melting pot was long used as a metaphor, but the result was a Swedish blend. This also means, that ideologies that promote bilingualism stubbornly and in reality, are bound to face attempts to compromise, but on the conditions of the assimilating forces. Linguistic diversity thus, like has bilingualism been, has generally only been acceptable, if it is of some interest for the prototypical Swede, not when it supports the development of diversity in practice. This is probably also at least partly the result of the several decades long hegemony of Swedish Social Democracy, which as one principle suggested the *equal treatment* of all. As a recent contrast, in part substantiated in present-day policies, the target has rather become to promote *equal opportunities* to all.

There is also a strong tradition today, between the politically correct (and today simultaneously, radically democratic) striving to support the weaker groups in society, and what reality dictates. This gap between theory and implementation has been clearly evident in modern Swedish educational history, resulting in for example a failed support to bilingual education.

In the late 1960s, Swedish politicians, school people, social workers, and representatives of the larger migrant communities, started discussing how to better integrate the children of migrants, as well as the adult migrants (e.g., the articles in Hamberg & Hammar (eds.) 1981). Assimilation had been found to cause problems for migrant children, but also to disturb the instructional "harmony" of monolingual Swedish children. It also turned out, that the expected proportion of returnees among the migrants to Sweden never grew that large. Until then, the Swedish policy concerning the indigenous groups was that there were no other ethnic groups in Sweden than Swedes, and especially that no minorities existed in Sweden. Most of the improvements that later have turned out

advantageous for minorities as well, stemmed from the work of integrating immigrants. Especially noteworthy was the Immigrant Committee report in 1974 (*SOU 1974:69*), which in practice set out to create some form of minority policy. Of great impact was the creation of principles for mother tongue instruction and education for migrant children. The minority children of indigenous groups were so-to-say, included with the rest. In 1983, another committee stated that Sweden is to become a multicultural society (*SOU 1983:57*). This statement, however, coincided with a slowing down of the economy, and the deconstruction of cultural and educational support for all minority groups, with the exception of Swedish as a second language.

The policy of the 1970s was politically and ideologically liberal. In practice, however, the results were poorer, and especially difficult was it to convince the municipalities. As long as the state budget supported the policy, it survived somehow, but with economically harder times, the resistance became overt in most municipalities. This conservative tradition was reinforced in 1991, when the state took a step backward, in relation to municipal self-government. The conflict between state policy and municipal self-government remains a major problem for the implementation of most nationally valid political decisions that refer to migrants, bilingual education, linguistic diversity etc.

The general national policy has been open-minded, especially in the opening formulations of various documents. For example, all children in the Swedish primary school are given a (theoretical) possibility to develop active bilingualism. In practice, this has become a national large-scale failure during the 1990s. With regard to the minority pupils in general, they are also given the opportunity – or obligation when needed – to receive instruction in Swedish as a second language. Largely, even if one can see a difference in degree, this has had a tendency to fail. In fact, there seems to be a difference in language policy activities that concern majority children, and those that concern minority children, to the advantage of the former. It is easier to learn English, than another modern language, it is easier to learn another modern language, than to receive Swedish as a second language-instruction, and, it is easier to receive Swedish as a second language-instruction than mother tongue instruction in compulsory school. This can be supported by a handful of recent reports and summarised data (cf. Lainio 2000b, 2001, forthc.). There is a long tradition of

instrumental and formally promoted learning of the "right" languages, for the established layers of society, and later the "middle-class" (Low German, French, Latin, German, and now, English). The multicultural and –lingual approach may succeed, if it does not become perceived of as a threat to the hegemonic pattern of support to Swedish and the dominant Swedish culture at a deeper level. Consequently, it seems to be easier to receive general support for the inclusion of Spanish as a foreign language to be taught in the compulsory school, than to arrange mother tongue instruction in the same language for minority students. One can infer from this, that not only normativity and attitudes play important roles, but also the prestige of the various languages and cultures concerned, as well as the social status of the recipient students, are crucial.

One can finally say, that Sweden has developed a tradition of confrontation with its minorities, but with the possibility of compromising – on the conditions of the stronger part. This is to my mind reflected in the modern treatment of minorities in Sweden. As a contrast, Finland has faced confrontations based on the accepted fact that there is some diversity: there are two (major) groups in society. Such confrontations have been attempted to be solved in co-operation between the majority and minority group's positions (proportionally; the Swedish-speaking Finland Swedes). For example, in virtually all Finnish governments during its independence, there has been at least one Swedish-speaking minister. As one concrete detail reflecting this, the treatment of the first National reports to the Council of Europe, referring to the European Charter and the Framework Convention can be used. In Finland, the report was largely a result of co-writing, in Sweden, the ministerial official stance vis-á-vis the minorities has been that "we [the majority/Swedes] write our report, but you are invited to write your own".

With regard to the issue of linguistic diversity then, and to the status of European Fundamental Human rights, and linguistic rights in particular, the two countries can be expected to treat them according to their diachronic-historical, "duree" discourse on these matters (cf. Blommaert 1999). Sweden would thus be expected to reject the idea of linguistic rights for minorities in particular, but promote human rights for all in general. At the end a compromise would be agreed upon. Finland will promote linguistic rights, for selected groups in

particular, but will have less to say about the general linguistic rights for other groups.

One should remind of the fact, finally, that the roads to national feelings of cohesion, have in both Finland and Sweden been connected to the issue of language. In Sweden, despite its obvious tradition of real diversity, one has opted for a monolithic direction (one language – one nation – one people), in essence supporting only the dominant language and culture, Swedish. In Finland, one has opted for the officially divided – or shared – tradition of bilingualism (one mind – two languages), at least at the societal level. In neither case, however, has there been an extensive understanding for the different Other, and both have for example consistently tried to assimilate the Saamis and other groups residing within their borders, or the opposite, leaving them fully marginalised.

7. The differentiated outcomes of linguistic diversity in Finland and Sweden

Roughly, one can claim that opportunities to learn languages, for majority and minority children in the two countries, reflect how the countries treat the Articles 21 and 22 in the European Charter of Fundamental Rights. How such opportunities are provided for, first, for Finnish in Sweden and Swedish in Finland, and second, for indigeneous and recent migrant as well as ethnolinguistic groups in the two countries, will be closer examined below.

The situation for Swedish in Finland is constantly one of a protected language, but it seems that despite a political consensus at a higher level, there are some determined linguo-nationalistic politicians who try to diminish for example the teaching of Swedish to majority, Finnish-speaking children. In Sweden, it is on the verge of becoming politically correct to support the indigenous minorities, at least as a principle. This is, however, still generally resisted in the educational sector.

The Saami are facing a different type of difficulty, namely how to defend their historical rights to land use for their rein-deer herding and hunting, without this causing a conflict with other local people, who also require

The Saami are facing a different type of difficulty, namely how to defend their historical rights to land use for their rein-deer herding and hunting, without this causing a conflict with other local people, who also require similar rights. The definition of who is a Saami has thus become crucial, both in Finland and Sweden.

For other groups, the right for example to receive instruction in the mother tongue, is still restricted. Furthermore, the learning of Finnish as a second language in Finland, especially for adults, seems to need a closing of the gap basically between teaching for academic student of Finnish as a subject, and instruction to migrants with low or non-existent basic schooling. In Sweden, the role of L1 for migrants and some of the indigenous groups has become down-graded continuously from the end of the 1980s, whereas the learning of Swedish as a second language is increasingly being reinforced.

I believe it is fair to say that discrimination based on race is by far from terminated in Finland or Sweden, despite their comparatively high levels of achievement in this respect, and their international reputation. Official statistics may not be as telling as news reports may. In Sweden there has been an increasing report during the 1990s of Nazi attacks on migrants, and recently even vice versa. The same situation prevails in Finland, with blunt, everyday racial slurs, as well as direct attacks. Both countries still strongly support international fundamental rights in general, and most citizens comply with these. Training of public officials, municipal staff in schools, social services, the police force etc., are taking place in both countries. The question of discrimination based on religion, however, has seen a new phase developing after the terrorist attack in September 2001, on World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon: Muslims living in Finland and Sweden, like in various other Western countries, have faced occasional hostilities.

It seems especially to be the case that language is generally not considered to belong to the fundamental rights, neither in Sweden nor in Finland. In Finland explicit and practical support for fundamental (language) rights has traditionally concerned only Swedish among the lesser groups, in addition to Finnish, and in Sweden only Swedish and Swedes, the majority population. With the new minority legislation based on a European minority policy,

this also concerns the languages taken up or mentioned in the respective ratification instruments.

For other languages there are some demanding attempts going on in Sweden, with its three decades of tradition in this field. In Finland such support has not been initiated until the late 1990s, in practice also for Romani and to some extent for Saami. Despite these differences in time devoted to liberal ideas concerning migrant languages in the two countries, the reality for these groups is rather similar.

Both in Finland and Sweden a layered or hierarchical support may be distinguished, for different types of languages and ethnic groups. The hierarchical support given to various languages can roughly be described as follows. Main support is given in a descending order (Figures 1 and 2 below).

Figure 1. Estimation of language policy support given to children of different language backgrounds in the Finnish school system, descending order

0) Finnish, and Swedish
1a) Swedish, and Finnish as national/second languages and recently, 1b) English,
2), Modern languages (e.g. German, French, Russian, Spanish),
3) Saami
4) Russian, Romani,
5a) languages related to Finnish, e.g. Estonian, 5b) other migrant languages (e.g., Somali, Vietnamese and Kurdish)

In comparison, the situation in Sweden would be like in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Estimation of language policy support given to children of different language backgrounds in the Swedish school system, descending order

0) Swedish
1) English,
2) foreign modern languages (e.g. French, German, Spanish),
3) Swedish as a second language,
4) official minority languages: a) Saami (restricted area), b) Meänkieli and Finnish (restricted area), c) Finnish, Romani chib and Yiddish (nationally),
5) other mother tongues of migrants (e.g. Arabic, Turkish, Greek, Chinese, Kurdish, Syrian, Polish, Spanish).

In Sweden the White Paper of the European Parliament in 1995 and the European *Council Resolution* (1997), which recommends that all European children should in a foreseeable future preferably know at least three languages, is supported already by the traditional school system. One language, which after about 1946 is English (replacing German), is given priority. In addition, all children have been expected to learn either of the two major European languages French or German. From the 1980s, Spanish has joined the pair, and from the late 1990s, it is catching up on the other two. In fact, at least German is facing a minor crisis in popularity among Swedish students. The situation is largely the same in Finland, with regard to foreign languages.

If one tries to predict linguistic diversity for individuals, in the sense that an outcome with regard to language competence in different languages is estimated, the picture in the two countries would differ somewhat. There will, as expected, be a difference in the expected outcome with regard to

language competence, depending on whether one discusses a majority or minority child. The outcome in Finland can be estimated to be like in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Estimated outcome regarding language competence of the support given to children of different language backgrounds in Finland

A Finnish majority child would learn: Finnish, Swedish, English, modern languages x 1 or 2
A Finnish national minority child would learn: Finland Swedish: Swedish, Finnish, English, foreign language(s), Saami: Finnish, Saami (North Saami), English, (Swedish), foreign language?
Other children would learn: Finnish, Finnish as a second language, (Swedish L2), English, (Mother tongue), (foreign language)

In Sweden, the corresponding picture would seem like the one in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Estimated outcome regarding language competence of the support given to children of different language backgrounds in Sweden

A Swedish majority child would learn: Swedish, English, 1-2 foreign languages (and limited/non-existent possibility for majority children to learn any of the indigenous languages)
A minority child (national) would learn: Swedish/Swedish L2, English, mother tongue, foreign language(s)
A minority child of other background would learn:

Swedish L2/Swedish, ?English, mother tongue, (foreign languages)

8. Final remarks

Though the background description has been more extensive here than the concrete discussion about the educational-linguistic effects, it is believed that the perspective of language instruction and language-in-education policy reflects wider attitudes regarding diversity, and how to approach it. This presumably concerns both the views of the majorities and the involved minorities. There would thus be a strong support in both countries for retaining the domination of the majority languages, and the view of the monolingual as the "ideal" speaker and member of the communities. Today, this view may possibly be amended with: "...if she/he knows English, as well". The recent support for the national minorities contributes to and creates two conflicting tendencies. First, the implementation of such support is far from successful in practice, and especially in Sweden, the distance between theory and practice is still considerable. Second, the other languages of migrated groups are rather coming to lag behind, than receiving an increased societal support for the reproduction of their languages. In this respect, the two countries run the risk of turning more "domestically" protective, than their continental fellow Europeans. At the present, some more or less privatised options (in Sweden, independent schools), and experimental (in Finland, immersion programmes in Swedish for Finnish-speaking parents and children) schools, may partly counteract this. There is also a tendency, that a streamlining into a dual system is developing, again more clearly in Sweden: the dominance of Swedish and the international and national *lingua franca*, English, is pushing the other languages in the background.

There is in a comparative perspective then, little room for complacency for neither of the two liberal democracies up North – their general degree of societal progression is not fully in line with pan-European progressive views on linguistic diversity. However, at least in Sweden, some more profound changes have been planned for the L1 status of migrant languages in the Swedish compulsory school system. This is both based on concern shown the poor position of Finnish in school (*Skolverket*, 2001), and the potential of a renewed teacher

training programme (starting in the fall of 2001). A report on the conditions for the different L1s in the Swedish school, has also been scheduled (Tuomela, forthc.). But before we can say that the situation is in fact improving, we need to see what practical results this evaluation will bring about, and to what extent for example Finland will follow the steps of Sweden, this time. Regarding the "mirror picture" between Finland and Sweden, one recent change has been observed in Finland. Through the slowly improving status and prestige in Sweden for Sweden Finnish, there is a greater willingness among both Finland Swedes and Finns in Finland, to connect their policy statements to that of Swedish in Finland. Through this, since the level of legal protection is high especially for Swedish in Finland, but also due to the recent interest shown the position of Finnish in Sweden, there is some hope that both minority languages will face somewhat better future prospects, as compared to their recent respective positions.

9. Abbreviations

SKU = Statens Kulturarvsutredning [The Governmental report on Cultural Heritage.]
SOU = Statens Offentliga Utredningar [The Governmental/Parliament/public committee and commission reports.]

10. References

- Aikio, Samuli *et al.* 1994. *The Saami Culture in Finland*. Helsinki: Lapin Sivistysseura.
- *Att förstå varandra i Norden*, 1997. Stockholm: Nordiska rådet/Nordiska ministerrådet/Nordiska Språkrådet
- Barddal, Jóhanna, Jörgensen, Nils, Larsen, Gorm & Martinussen, Bente 1997. *Nordiska Våra språk förr och nu*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Bijvoet, Ellen forthc. Paper given at the 8th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism, held in Stockholm in November 2001. Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.
- Blommaert, Jan (ed.) 1999. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Boyd, Sally & Gadelii, Erland 1999. Vem tillhör talgemenskapen? Om jiddisch i Sverige. In: Hyltenstam, K. (ed.) 1999, 299-328.

- Boyd, Sally & Huss, Leena (eds.) 2001. *Managing pluralism in a European nation-state: Challenges for Sweden*. Clevedon, Boston, Toronto & Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Broeder, Peter & Extra, Guus 1998. Migration and multilingualism in Western Europe: The Netherlands as Case Study. In: Extra, G. & Maartens, J. (eds.) 1998, 141-160.

- Börestam Uhlmann, Ulla 1994. *Skandinaver samtalar*. Skrifter från institutionen för nordiska språk, 38, Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.

- *Council Resolution* 1997 = Council Resolution of 16 December 1997 on the early teaching of European Union languages Official Journal C 001 , 03/01/1998, p. 2 – 3.

- *Det mångkulturella Sverige*, 1990. Runblom, H. & Svanberg, I. (eds.). 2nd edition. Centre for Multietnic Research. Uppsala.

- Extra, Guus & Maartens, Jeanne (eds.) 1998. *Multilingualism in a multicultural context*. Studies in Multilingualism, 10. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

- Fraurud, Kari et al. 2001. Språk och språkbruk bland ungdomar i flerspråkiga storstadsmiljöer. (Project plan.) Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.

- Graddol, David & Meinhof, Ulrike H. (eds.) 1999. English in a Changing World. *AILA Review 13*. Oxford: Catchline/The English Company Ltd.

- Hallenberg, Mats 2001. *Kungen, fogdarna och riket. Lokalförvaltning och statsbyggande under tidig Vasatid*. Stockholm/Stehag: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.

- Hamberg, Eva M. & Hammar, Tomas (eds.) 1981. *Invandringen och framtiden*. Stockholm: Publica.

- Hasselmo, Nils 1974. *Amerikasvenska*, Skrifter utgivna av Svenska språknämnden, 51, Lund.

- Huovinen, Sulo 1986. Finska språkets ställning i det svenska riket. In: Huovinen, Sulo (ed.) *Finland i det svenska riket*, 65-87. Stockholm: Kulturfonden för Sverige och Finland.

- Huss, Leena 1999. *Reversing Language Shift in the Far North*. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia, 31. Uppsala: Department of Finno-Ugric Languages.

- Hyltenstam, Kenneth (ed.) 1999. *Sveriges sju inhemska språk: Ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth & Fraurud, Kari 1999. Språkkontakt och språkbevarande. Romani i Sverige. In: Hyltenstam, Kenneth (ed.) 1999, 241-298.
- Initial Periodical Report presented to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe in accordance with Article 15 of the Charter. Min-Lang/PR (99) 4. Finland. Strasbourg, 1 April 1999.
- Kaplan, Richard Jr & Baldauf, Robert M. 1997. *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon, Boston, Toronto & Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- *Kielikello*, 2001. [The language cultivation periodical of Kotus/Kotimaisten kielten Tutkimuskeskus, Helsinki.]
- *Kielilainsäädäntö*, 2001. Kansainvälisoikeudelliset velvoitteet ja kansainvälinen vertailu. Lainvalmisteluosaston julkaisu / Lagberedningsavdelningens publikation 1/2001. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö/OY Edita AB.
- Lainio, Jarmo 2000a. Sweden, its social splits and language studies at the turn of the millenium. International Yearbook European Sociolinguistics. *Die Zukunft der europäischen Soziolinguistik. Sociolinguistica*, 14:183-191. Ammon, U.,
- Mattheier, Klaus & Nelde, P.H. (eds.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Lainio, Jarmo 2000b. Swedish society and language studies at the turn of the century – An overview. In: Lainio, Jarmo, *Tre veteraner – Tre tributer*, 105-133. Stockholm Studies in Finnish Language and Literature, 9. Stockholm University.
- Lainio, Jarmo 2000c. The protection and rejection of minority and majority languages in the Swedish school system. In: Boyd, Sally & Huss, Leena (eds.) 2001, 32-50.
- Lainio, Jarmo 2001. Finnic languages in education in Sweden – Finnish and Meänkieli. Regional dossiers Series. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy and Mercator-Education.
- Rampton, Ben 1995. *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London & New York: Longman.
- *The Role of the European Union in Supporting Minority or Lesser Used Languages and an Overview of the Minority Language Communities in the Member States of the EU. Volume 1: Greece, Spain, Finland, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, United Kingdom*. CIEMEN-Education and Culture Series, EDUC 108 EN. Winther, Pernille & Strubell, Miquel (eds.). Luxembourg: European Parliament, Directorate-General for Research (in press).

- *Skolverket*, 2001. Undervisning i och på de nationella minoritetsspråken – kartläggning av situationen 2001. Dnr 2000:3438. Stockholm: Skolverket.

- *SOU 1974:69*. Invandrarutredningen 3. Huvudbetänkande av invandrarutredningen. Invandrarna och minoriteterna. Stockholm: Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet.

- *SOU 1983:57*. SKU, Språk- och kulturarvsutredningen. Olika ursprung – gemenskap i Sverige. Utbildning för språklig och kulturell mångfald. Huvudbetänkande av språk- och kulturarvsutredningen. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.

- *Swedish report on the Council of Europe Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*, 2001. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet/Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.

- *Swedish report to the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minority Languages*, 2001. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet/ Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.

-Tuomela, Veli (forthc. 2001) Modersmålsundervisningen – En forskningsöversikt. Stockholm: Skolverket.

- Turell, Teresa M. (ed.) 2001. *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of linguistic minority groups*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Vikør, Lars 1993. *The Nordic Languages: Their Status and Interrelations*. Oslo: Novus Press.

- Winsa, Birger 1999. Language Planning in Sweden. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, Vol. 20:4&5, 376-473.

mercator

dret i legislació lingüístics

Rocafort 242 bis
08029 Barcelona Catalunya
Tel (+34) 93 444 38 01
Fax (+34) 93 444 38 09
mercator@ciemen.org
cdoc@ciemen.org
www.troc.es/ciemen/mercator/

18

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

FL 027810

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Blanket)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION (Class of Documents):

All Publications: European Linguistic Diversity - for whom? The cases of Finland and Sweden	
Series (Identify Series): Mercator "Working Papers" collection (7)	
Division/Department Publications (Specify): Mercator - Linguistic Rights and Legislation	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate these documents as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Sergi Vilars		Printed Name/Position/Title: Coordinator	
Organization/Address: Rocafort, 242. bis 08029 - Barcelona Catalonia - SPAIN		Telephone: +34 93 444 38 01	FAX: +34 93 444 38 09
		E-Mail Address: mercator@ciemen.org	Date: June 3rd, 2003

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of these documents from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of these documents. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	Laura Laino
Address:	Rocafort, 242, bis (CIEMEN-Mercator) 08029 - Barcelona Catalonia - SPAIN

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the documents being contributed) to:

Post-it® Fax Note 7671	Date 6/11	# of pages ▶
To Sergi Vilaro	From Laura
Co./Dept.	Co. CTL
Phone #	Phone #
Fax # 34 93 444 3809	Fax # 202-363-7204

EFF-087 (Rev. 2/2000)